

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

* * *

Mark Clifford Sykes,

Case No. 2:21-cv-01479-RFB-DJA

Plaintiff,

Order

V.

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, et al.,

Defendants.

12 Before the Court is Plaintiff's motion to extend the time for service. (ECF No. 34).

13 Plaintiff explains that he recently learned that Defendant Officer Hunt is no longer employed with
14 the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (“LVMPD”) and thus needs additional time to
15 locate him for service. Plaintiff asks for an additional 90 days to complete service. The service
16 deadline is set to end on May 31, 2023. (ECF No. 23 at 9).

17 Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m), “if the plaintiff shows good cause for the
18 failure [to serve a defendant within 90 days after the complaint is filed], the court must extend the
19 time for service for an appropriate period.” Here, Plaintiff has demonstrated good cause for being
20 unable to serve Defendant Hunt within the 90 days allotted. As Plaintiff points out, Officer Hunt
21 is no longer employed by the LVMPD and Plaintiff must attempt to locate him. Plaintiff is also
22 proceeding *pro se*.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion (ECF No. 34) is **granted**.

24 Plaintiff shall have until **August 28, 2023** to complete service.

DATED: May 30, 2023



DANIEL J. ALBREGTS
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE